

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 ROBERT SUSTRIK, et al.,  
11 Plaintiff(s),

12 vs.

13 EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES, LLC,  
14 Defendant(s).  
15

)  
) Case No. 2:16-cv-02866-RFB-NJK  
)  
) ORDER  
)  
) (Docket No. 57)  
)  
)

16 Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' motion to extend the discovery cutoff by 90 days. Docket  
17 No. 57. Defendant filed a response in partial opposition, agreeing only to an extension of 30 days.  
18 Docket No. 60. Plaintiffs filed a reply. Docket No. 62. Had common-sense practicality and cooperation  
19 prevailed during the meet-and-confer process, this dispute would not have required judicial intervention.  
20 *Cf. Olesczuk v. Citizens One Home Loans*, 2016 U.S. Dist. Lexis 153342, at \*2-3 (D. Nev. Nov. 4,  
21 2016).<sup>1</sup> Having now reviewed the motion and briefing, the Court finds good cause exists for a 60-day  
22

---

23 <sup>1</sup> The parties contacted chambers in an attempt to resolve this dispute informally pursuant to Local  
24 Rule 1-1(b) before conducting their required meet-and-confer on the dispute. See Docket No. 57-1 at ¶ 22  
25 ("Because the Court indicated its preference for briefing, the parties held their 26-7 conference"). As the  
26 Court has explained previously, an informal conference with chambers may not be used a substitute for  
27 conducting a meet-and-confer. See *Olesczuk*, 2016 U.S. Dist. Lexis 153342, at \*2 ("Local Rule 1-1 has not  
28 transformed magistrate judges into clearinghouses for resolving insignificant discovery disputes. Counsel  
are still expected to seek court involvement as a last resort only when a discovery dispute implicates truly  
significant interests that counsel cannot resolve through reasonable cooperation during the meet-and-confer  
process").

1 extension of the discovery cutoff and subsequent deadlines.<sup>2</sup> The motion to extend is therefore

2 **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part, and deadlines are **SET** as follows:

- 3 • Discovery cutoff: January 8, 2018
- 4 • Dispositive motions: February 7, 2018
- 5 • Joint proposed pretrial order: March 9, 2018

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 DATED: October 20, 2017



8  
9 NANCY J. KOPPE  
United States Magistrate Judge

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 

---

<sup>2</sup> In briefing the motion to extend, the parties provide argument regarding the appropriateness of certain discovery sought. The Court expresses no opinion herein on those issues.